

THE IMPACT OF NLO CORRECTIONS ON THE DETERMINATIONS OF THE $\bar{u}, \bar{d}$ CONTENT OF NUCLEONS FROM DRELL-YAN PRODUCTION

W. SCHÄFER

Institut für Kernphysik, Forschungszentrum Jülich, D-52425 Jülich

The interpretation of Drell-Yan production in terms of the antiquark densities depends on NLO corrections. Besides the NLO corrections to the familiar annihilation $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow l^+l^-$, there is a substantial contribution from the QCD Compton subprocesses $gq \rightarrow q\gamma^* \rightarrow ql^+l^-$ and $g\bar{q} \rightarrow q\gamma^* \rightarrow ql^+l^-$. The beam and target dependence of the two classes of corrections is different. We discuss the impact of this difference on the determination of the $\bar{d} - \bar{u}$ asymmetry in the proton from the comparison of the pp and pn Drell-Yan production.

The substantial $\bar{d} - \bar{u}$ asymmetry of the nucleon sea is a striking manifestation of the leading twist nonperturbative mesonic effects in parton distributions (for the recent review and references see¹). The first indirect experimental evidence for this asymmetry has been deduced from the Gottfried sum rule evaluation², but it left of course open the x -dependence of the $\bar{d} - \bar{u}$ asymmetry. Following a suggestion by Ellis and Stirling³, the CERN NA51 collaboration has measured the $\bar{d} - \bar{u}$ asymmetry at $x \simeq 0.18$ from the comparison of the pp and $pn(pd)$ Drell-Yan production. The asymmetry proved to be large and placed at large x , in good agreement with expectations from meson cloud models^{2,7}. Recently, a much more detailed and higher precision comparison of the pp and pd Drell-Yan production has been performed in the Fermilab E866 experiment. Furthermore there are plans of the dedicated Drell-Yan experiment at Fermilab with the goal of measuring the flavour content of the sea up to $x \sim 0.6$ ⁴. The accuracy of the E866 experiment is so high that one must wonder about the impact of next-to-leading order (NLO) corrections on the comparison of Drell-Yan production on different targets. The point is that one would like to interpret the Drell-Yan process in terms of the annihilation of quarks from the beam hadron on antiquarks in the target hadron. Roughly speaking, in a suitable kinematic domain, Drell-Yan production is dominated by annihilation of the valence u -quarks of the beam proton on the $\bar{u}$ -sea in the target proton. Because the valence densities are well known, in the pp -Drell-Yan production one measures the $\bar{u}$ sea. Invoking the charge symmetry, the pn -Drell-Yan measures the $\bar{d}$ sea and the ratio of the pn and pp cross sections gives an access to the $\bar{d}/\bar{u}$ ratio. NLO corrections spoil this simple picture. They fall into two broad categories⁶: the QCD radiative corrections to the familiar annihilation (ANN) $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow l^+l^-$ retain the property of the

Drell-Yan cross section being a (sum over flavours of the) product of quark and antiquark densities. The second class of corrections however comes from the 'QCD-Compton' (QCDC) subprocesses $gq \rightarrow q\gamma^*$ and $g\bar{q} \rightarrow \bar{q}\gamma^*$ and has the form of a certain convolution of the gluon and quark+antiquark densities in the beam and target and vice versa. The difference in the beam and target parton contents of the two classes of corrections and their dependence on the form of the parton densities raise several issues: Firstly it is well established that NLO corrections, ususally parametrised in terms of the so-called K_{DY} -factor, $K_{DY} = d\sigma_{DY}(LO + NLO)/d\sigma_{DY}(LO)$, are large: $K_{DY} \approx 1.5 - 2$. Second, the x -dependence of the gluon and sea densities is different, and there is a troubling possibility that the relative size of the contributions from annihilation and QCDC NLO corrections changes over the space of the beam and target Bjorken variables. Furthermore the NLO corrections depend on the shape of parton distributions, and may change the realative importance of the $u\bar{u}$ and $d\bar{d}$ annihilation contributions compared to the LO formulas. To summarize, the issue is that NLO corrections are large, and because in the E866 data the statistical accuracy of the measured pn/pp ratio is at the level of several percent, a scrutiny of those subtleties of the NLO corrections is called upon⁵.

The purpose of the present study is an investigation of the beam and target dependence of NLO corrections relevant to the interpretation of the pn/pp data; we shall be primarily interested in the region of rather large x relevant to the E866-data. The contributions from the NLO corrections to the differential cross section appear in the form

$$\frac{d\Delta\sigma_A}{dQ^2 dx_F} \propto \sum_f e_f^2 \Delta_{f\bar{f}}(t_1, t_2, x_1, x_2, Q^2) \otimes [f_1(t_1, Q^2)\bar{f}_2(t_2, Q^2) + (1 \leftrightarrow 2)] \quad (1)$$

for the annihilation corrections of Fig. 1 IIa); and similarly for the QCDC corrections (fig 1 IIb,c):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Delta\sigma_C}{dQ^2 dx_F} \propto & \left\{ \Delta_{fg}(t_1, t_2, x_1, x_2, Q^2) \otimes \left(\sum_f e_f^2 [f_1(t_1, Q^2) + \bar{f}_1(t_1, Q^2)] \right) g_2(t_2, Q^2) \right. \\ & \left. + \Delta_{gf}(t_1, t_2, x_1, x_2, Q^2) \otimes g_1(t_1, Q^2) \left(\sum_f e_f^2 [f_2(t_2, Q^2) + \bar{f}_2(t_2, Q^2)] \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The convolution sign here implies an integration in the variables $t_i, i = 1, 2$ over the domain $x_i < t_i < 1$ and all the required coefficient functions $\Delta_{f\bar{f}}, \Delta_{fg}$ are available in the literature⁶. For our purposes it is most convenient to study the dependende on flavour etc. in terms of partial $\mathcal{K}$ -factors, that parametrise the NLO-corrections in the following manner:

$$\Delta_{f\bar{f}}(t_1, t_2, x_1, x_2, Q^2) \otimes f_1(t_1, Q^2)\bar{f}_2(t_2, Q^2) =$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{K}_{f\bar{f}}(x_1, n_f, x_2, n_{\bar{f}}) \cdot f_1(x_1, Q^2) \bar{f}_2(x_2, Q^2) \\ & \Delta_{fg}(t_1, t_2, x_1, x_2, Q^2) \otimes f_1(t_1, Q^2) g_2(t_2, Q^2) = \\ & \mathcal{K}_{fg}(x_1, n_f, x_2, n_g) \cdot f_1(x_1, Q^2) (1 - x_2) g_2(x_2, Q^2). \end{aligned}$$

The functions $\mathcal{K}_{f\bar{f}}, \mathcal{K}_{fg}$ now bear a dependence on the *functional form* of the parton distributions which is encoded here through the exponents n_f, n_g of the large- x behaviour, $f(x, Q^2) \sim (1 - x)^{n_f}, g(x, Q^2) \sim (1 - x)^{n_g}$. The above shown expressions enter the calculation of the experimentally measured cross section, and the n_f, n_g -dependence clearly demonstrates the potential model dependence of the extraction of $\bar{u}, \bar{d}$ -densities from experimental data. Let us emphasize that there is no theoretical a priori reason that the QCDC contributions should mimic the $q\bar{q}$ -annihilation processes over a wide (x_1, x_2, Q^2) -range. In figure 1 we show a variety of partial $\mathcal{K}$ -factors for two representative parametrizations of the parton distributions. A substantial dependence on flavour, x_1 and x_2 can clearly be seen. As a matter of fact, for $x_{1,2} > 0.5 - 0.6$ the parton distributions are so poorly known, that the calculations in that region have little reliability. In particular the interpretation of Drell-Yan experiments at larger $x_{1,2}$ values shall be strongly model dependent. In the region of $x_{1,2}$ relevant to the E866 experiment however the model dependence turns out to be weak within the experimental error bars and an extraction of $\bar{d}/\bar{u}$ in the LO formalism can still be trusted.

References

1. J. Speth and A.W. Thomas, KFA-IKP(TH)-1996-05, *Adv. in Nucl. and Part. Phys.*, eds. J. Negele and E. Vogt, in print (1998)
2. NMC Collab., P. Amaudruz et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 2712 (1991)
3. S.D. Ellis and W.J. Stirling, *Phys. Lett. B* **256**, 258 (1991).
4. G.T. Garvey, private communication
5. N.N. Nikolaev, W. Schäfer and J. Speth, paper in preparation
6. P.J. Rijken and W.L. van Neerven, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 44 (1995)
7. H. Holtmann, N.N. Nikolaev, A. Szczurek and J. Speth, *Z. Phys. A* **353**, 411 (1996); A. Szczurek, M. Ericson, H. Holtmann and J. Speth, *Nucl. Phys. A* **596**, 397 (1996)
8. Fermilab E866/NuSea Collab.: E.A. Hawker et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 3715 (1998), Fermilab E866/NuSea Collab.: L.D. Isenhower, these proceedings




Figure 1: I: A selection of partial $\mathcal{K}$ -factors calculated with two representative parametrizations of parton densities; shown as function of x_2 for several x_1 -values: $x_1 = 0.35$ (solid); $x_1 = 0.55$ (dashed); $x_1 = 0.75$ (dot-dashed); i.e. x_1 grows from bottom to top curves. II: a) gluon bremsstrahlung correction to the $q\bar{q}$ annihilation, b) QCDC contributions.